

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY **REGION IX**

75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105 SFUND RECORDS CTR

January 11, 2010

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT:

Tujunga Wellfield Site Discovery, Stage III: Monitoring Well Installation, Sampling

and Analysis Plan, Los Angeles County, CA (EPA QA Office Document Control

Number [DCN] ZZCA0210SV1)

FROM:

Quality Assurance Office, MTS-3

Eugenia E. McNaughton, Ph.D., Manager
Quality Assurance Office, MTS-3 THROUGH: Eugenia E. McNaughton, Ph.D., Manager

TO:

Matt Mitguard, Site Assessment Manager

States, Tribes, and Site Assessment Office, SFD-9-1

A sampling and analysis plan (SAP) for the Tujunga Wellfield, Stage III: Monitoring Well Installation in Los Angeles County, CA, prepared by Weston Solutions, Inc., and dated December 2009, has been reviewed. The review was based on information provided in the following documents: "EPA Requirements for Quality Assurance Project Plans" (EPA OA/R-5, March 2001); "Guidance for Quality Assurance Project Plans" (EPA QA/G-5, December 2002); and "Guidance for the Data Quality Objectives Process" (EPA QA/G-4, August 2000).

The plan addresses many elements required by Regional guidance; however, several areas require additional information and/or clarification. The subject document is conditionally approved by the QA Office pending resolution of the following comments and submission of a revised SAP.

In order to facilitate the QA Office review of the revised SAP, it is suggested that a response to comments (RTC) memorandum be submitted which includes how and where changes were made in the plan. If you have any questions or need any further information, please feel free to contact me at 415-972-3807.

Comments -

[Section 1.0, Introduction] Some of the references listed in this section are out of date and 1. should be updated.

Mr. Matt Mitguard January 11, 2010

- 2. [Table 1, Organization Chart; Section 8.4, Sample Labeling, Packaging and Shipping.] Mary O'Donnell is no longer the Region 9 Sample Control Coordinator. The table and Section 8.4 should be updated.
- 3. [Section 2.5, Waste Characteristics; Section 3.5.3, Data Quality Indicators; Table 2, Inorganic Analyses and Action Levels; Table 3, Organic Analyses and Action Levels] Section 3.5.3 states: "The analytical method detection limits for each analyte of concern are lower than the MCLs for groundwater as shown in Tables 2 and 3." Some of the MCLs in Tables 2 and 3 are lower than their corresponding detection limits. If the only analytes of concern are those listed in Section 2.5, this should be stated. It is recommended that the analytes of concern be highlighted on the tables.
- 4A. Section 5.0, Request for Analyses; Table 4, Request for Analyses, Water Matrix] The second paragraph states that 10% of the screening level samples "will be submitted for definitive analysis, for a total of three groundwater samples." The plan should describe how these samples will be selected. It would be appropriate to include this information in Section 4.1.
- 4B. This section states that an equipment blank will be collected for each day of sampling. However, the blanks in Table 4 are listed as field blanks. This discrepancy should be corrected.
- 5A. [Section 9.1.2, Assessment of Field Variability (Field Duplicate or Co-located Samples); Table 4, Request for Analyses, Water Matrix] This section states that duplicate groundwater samples will be collected at the sample locations indicated in Table 4. Of the three duplicates to be collected during the installation of the pilot well, only one specifies a sample depth. If the other two sampling depths are to be determined in the field, this should be stated along with the criteria that will be used to select these sampling intervals.
- 5B. Table 4 indicates that sample TJ-GW-7 will be a duplicate sample. However, the table does not specify which well this is a duplicate of. If the duplicate location is to be determined in the field, this should be stated along with the criteria that will be used.